Information on visual impairments/disabilities/learning difficulties reported in the 2000/01 questionnaire
deaf preschool children and group A school pupils in Scotland by classification* of eyesight issues indicated in survey returns 2000/01 (n=258)

- not VI: 154 (60%)
- likely to be VI: 49 (19%)
- possibly VI: 31 (12%)
- definitely VI: 24 (9%)

*Classified by Dr Andrew Blaikie, Opthalmology Research Fellow, Scottish Sensory Centre.
Coding System for VI Classification

As suggested by Andrew Blaikie
(Ophthalmology Research Fellow, Scottish Sensory Centre)

Not VI
No suggestion that the child should be VI although can’t say for absolute certainty. Most common category is ‘wears glasses’.

Possibly VI
Condition predisposes to VI, but not enough information to be sure that it is bilateral (eg ‘cataracts’ – this would only be classed as VI if bilateral).

Likely to be VI
Condition usually leaves child with some form of bilateral uncorrectable visual difficulty. Most brain conditions included here (eg cerebral palsy [expect 70% have VI] and Downs Syndrome [some argue 90-100% have VI]

Definitely VI
Description of visual difficulty and condition makes VI a certainty

Rule of thumb: VI=6/18 or less (fourth line from bottom of Snellen Chart)
Medical Conditions (other than VI) and Learning Difficulties

- 355 individual medical conditions reported
- 6 times as many pupils were reported to have social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (146) as the next highest specific learning difficulty, dyslexia (25)
- 207 children were reported to have ‘other cognitive or language processing disorders’
Why do we need an overall % of ‘deaf pupils with additional disabilities’?

• Planning of additional resources
• Viewing the ‘whole child’
• Explaining any underachievement?
Percentages reported of ‘deaf children with additional disabilities’

- 30.2% Gallaudet Research Institute (1983)
- 38.7% MRC IHR: ‘Trent study’ (1996)
- 43.4% Gallaudet Research Institute (2000/01)
- 30.1% MRC IHR: UK study (1998)
Do such percentages lead to lower expectations of achievement compared to hearing children?

If so, is this justified?
• Do we know how the prevalence compares to the general population?

• How much does an individual condition impact on learning/access to the curriculum?

• Who diagnosed the condition and on what basis?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category 5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncategorised</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Classified by Dr Jackie Grigor, Consultant Paediatrician, Edinburgh Sick Children’s NHS Trust

WORK IN PROGRESS. PLEASE DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION.
**Coding System for Classification of Medical Conditions**

As suggested by Dr Jackie Grigor  
(Consultant Paediatrician, Edinburgh Sick Childrens' NHS Trust)

**Category 1**  
Unlikely to have a direct impact on learning, but may have.

**Category 2**  
Possible impact on learning, insufficient detail.

**Category 3**  
Likely to impact on learning.

**Category 4**  
Definite impact on learning (stated in response).

**Category 5**  
Not enough information given.
ADPS Survey 2000/01 - children with one or more entries in questionnaire related to VI/medical/cognitive conditions*

• 40.9% when all entries taken into account
• 35.2% when ‘not VI’ category excluded (where this is the only entry)
• 30.2% when ‘not VI’ and ‘category 1’ medical conditions excluded (where they are the only entries)
‘Other’ cognitive or language processing disorders among deaf pre-school children and group A school pupils in Scotland, as reported in questionnaire 2000/01 (n=207)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disorder</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild learning difficulties</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate learning difficulties</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe learning difficulties</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General learning difficulties</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental delay</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural difficulties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and language difficulties</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specific cognitive disorders</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other difficulties</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some examples of ‘other cognitive’ entries

‘Language delay/immature speech’
‘Speech and language development impaired’
‘Yes but no specific label’
‘Problem with reading’
‘Language delay’
‘Mild speech difficulty’
‘Speech is not entirely articulate’
There is a need for:

- caution over broad percentages which include categories of disability ‘for which there are no objective criteria for membership’ (danger of labelling);

- further investigation of meaningful impact of conditions on learning - quantity and quality;

- teachers of deaf children to get clear information on conditions which affect learning.